

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-14 are now present in this application. Claim 1 is independent.

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Corrected formal drawings of Figures 2-6 are submitted concurrently herewith.

Claim Amendments

Applicants have amended the claims in order to place the claims in better form. The claim amendments are not being made in response to any statutory requirement for patentability, and have not been narrowed in scope. Instead, the claims have been amended merely to recite the subject matter therein more clearly.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 3, 9-11, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,504,298 to Van Den Brink et al. (Van Den Brink). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in an implosion proof structure in a flat cathode ray tube having a panel upon which atmospheric pressure is exerted including implosion proof means strapped on an outer circumferential surface of a funnel in the vicinity of the panel of said flat cathode ray tube. Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Van Den Brink.

Those skilled in the art recognize that in CRTs, the tube itself is manufactured incorporating cathode ray tubes possessing rounded external surfaces both in the horizontal and vertical direction. The purpose of this curvature is to allow for good focus and convergence at the corners while taking advantage of the gun, yoke and circuit technologies used therewith. While this conventional CRT design delivered adequate brightness and fine resolution

capability, users also experienced some geometric distortion on the horizontal and vertical planes and increased glare from ambient lighting due to the curvature of the monitor face.

Van Den Brink discloses a conventional CRT having the rounded surfaces described above. It is clear from FIG. 1A that neither the funnel, nor the display window, has flat portions. Rather, these portions are rounded. One can determine that the CRT is not flat by applying a straight edge to the front surface of the drawing of the display window depicted in FIG. 1A. Further, the disclosure of Van Den Brink does not identify the display device as a flat cathode ray tube.

Moreover, the conventional CRT of Van Den Brink is related to the art of adjusting (or reducing) the thickness of the funnel glass and coating the outer circumferential surface thereof to solve the problem concerning the price and weight of the funnel. By contrast, the Applicants' claimed invention comprises an implosion proof means on an outer circumferential surface of the funnel in the vicinity of the panel to prevent the implosion of the cathode ray tube.

Therefore, Van Den Brink fails to teach a combination of elements in an implosion proof structure in a flat cathode ray tube having a panel upon which atmospheric pressure is exerted as the flat cathode ray tube is evacuated, including implosion proof means strapped on an outer circumferential surface of a funnel in the vicinity of the panel of said flat cathode ray tube, as recited in independent claim 1 (as amended).

With regard to dependent claims 3, 10-11 and 12, Applicants submit that claims 3, 10-11 and 12 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 3, 10-11 and 12 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claim 9 has been written in independent form to recite a combination of elements in an implosion proof structure in a flat cathode ray tube having a panel upon which atmospheric pressure is exerted as the flat cathode ray tube is evacuated, including implosion proof means coated on a flat portion of an outer circumferential surface of a funnel in the vicinity of the panel of said flat cathode ray tube, the implosion proof means being a coat of hardening adhesive with a required yield strength after it is hardened. Applicants respectfully submit that this combination of features is not disclosed or fairly suggested by the prior art of record, including Van Den Brink. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the art grounds of rejection of claim 9 is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner states that claims 2, 4-8, 13 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants thank the Examiner for the early

indication of allowable subject matter in this application. However, claims 2, 4-8, 13 and 14 have not been rewritten in independent form at this time, since it is believed that independent claim 1, from which these claims depend is allowable.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084, at (703) 205-8034, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 09/731,733
Art Unit 2882
Page 12

Attorney Docket No. 0465-0780P
Amendment filed November 7, 2003

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: James T. Eller, Jr. #41,458

James T. Eller, Jr.

Reg. No.: 39,538

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

Telephone: (703)205-8000

JTE:PLS:ndb/gf

0465-0780P